DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 313 174 RC 017 203

AUTHOR Dysart, Jane E.
TITLE Creek Women and the "Civilizing" of Creek Society, 1790-1820.
PUB DATE Apr 89
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Meeting of the Organization of American Historians (April, 1989).
PUB TYPE Historical Materials (060) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Acculturation; *American Indian History; American Indians; Child Rearing; Cultural Background; Family (Sociological Unit); *Family Life; Family Structure; *Females; Marriage; *Sex Role
IDENTIFIERS *Creek (Tribe); Frontier History; Matriarchy

ABSTRACT

Women in traditional Creek society, while making few decisions in the public domain, held almost absolute power in the domestic realm. When a Creek couple married, the husband moved into his wife's house and lived among her clan, her matrilineal kin. The house, household goods, fields, and children belonged to her. Boys were educated by their maternal uncles, while girls learned domestic skills from their mothers and female kin. The Creeks' strong conservatism in the 18th and 19th centuries was undoubtedly reinforced by the matrilineal clan and constant interaction among women of different generations. The Indian agent and Jeffersonian reformer, Benjamin Hawkins, considered that women played a crucial role in Creek society and thus had to be targeted as instruments of change. From 1796 until his death in 1816, Hawkins lived among the Creeks and zealously promoted the "civilization program" devised by federal officials to transform the Indians into yeoman farmers and confiscate their hunting grounds. The success of this policy required that the system of matrilineal kinship and communal property give way to one of patrilineal inheritance and private ownership of property. To accomplish these goals, Hawkins and his assistants established a "model" farm, taught Creek women to spin and weave, attempted (unsuccessfully) to create "model" families through marriage with Creek women, and sought to instill the work ethic and attachment to individual property. Although some Creeks and their leaders adopted the white lifestyle, most rejected it and in 1813 went to war to destroy the leaders and instruments of "progress." This paper contains 26 references. (SV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED313174

CREEK WOMEN AND THE "CIVILIZING" OF CREEK SOCIETY, 1790-1820

Organization of American Historians

April 1989

by

Jane E. Dysart

University of West Florida

RC017203

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Jane E. Dysart

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In 1794, several months after the death of Alexander McGillivray, his partner in the deerskin trade, William Panton, wrote the Creek leader's father in Scotland, "his effects were all in the Nation and his sisters Indian like, have seized the whole without paying any attention to his will or his poor orphans, they have divided the negroes among them and shared the cattle and horses that were in the nation." Indian-like, indeed! Sophie, Jenny, and Sehoy, the three McGillivray sisters were less than one-half Indian in blood; and, to a large extent, they had adopted white life styles, living on plantations and farms, preferring calicos and woolens to deerskins, silver earrings and beads to shells.[1] In seizing their brother's worldly goods, however, they reaffirmed their rights as Creek women within the matrilineal clan system and demonstrated the strength and endurance of matrilineal values.

Women in traditional Creek society, as anthropologist Charles Hudson puts it, were "influential rather than powerful." In the public domain--warfare, hunting, politics--men made the important decisions and played the leading roles, but in the domestic realm women reigned with almost absolute power. When a Creek couple married, the husband moved into his wife's house and lived among her clan, her matrilineal kin. The house, the household goods, the fields, and the children all belonged to her; and in case of divorce or her husband's death, her right to the property and the children was undisputed according to Creek custom. Boys were educated and disciplined by their mother's brother while the girls were socialized and taught domestic skills by their mother

and her female kin. Although a few instances of patrilineal succession and inheritance appear in the documents after European contact, most Creek families followed the old ways.[2]

Scattered through correspondence and old ledger sheets are the names of Creek women who, by virtue of their kinship connections in both cultures and their own abilities, became active in politics and trade. Both Sehoy Weatherford and Sophia Durant, sisters of Alexander McGillivray and women of the powerful Wind Clan, engaged in the Indian carrying their own accounts with the Scottish entrepreneur, William Panton until they angered him by seizing their brother's slaves and livestock. According to Benjamin Hawkins, the first United States superintendent of southern Indians, both women kept "the command absolute of everything from their husbands." The remarkable Sophia Durant supposedly even participated in Creek councils, interpreting and speaking for her brother, Alexander. According to Alabama historian Albert Pickett, she had an "air of authority about her, equal, if not superior to that of her brother, Alexander.[3] The majority of Creek women, however, carried on their usual household duties, reared children, and cultivated crops.

Observers of Creek society during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries frequently commented on the Creeks' conservatism, especially as compared to their neighbors, the Cherokees, Choctaws, and Chickasaws. Traveler, John Pope, noted in 1791, for instance, "No people under heaven are more attached to, or swerve less from, the customs of their ancestors than the

Creeks." That innate conservatism was undoubtedly reinforced by the matrilineal clan. Finding pottery made by Creek women in eighteenth and nineteenth century Creek sites long after European potter was readily available, anthropologists have concluded that the persistence of such household crafts was probably owing to the constant interaction between young Creek women and their female relatives. Not only did the young women learn potting from their grandmothers and other older female kin, the scholars surmise, but making the pottery served as a means of bonding the younger generation to the older and provided an opportunity for transmission of traditional values and customs. As long as Creek families remained in their towns and villages then, the women living and working in close proximity reinforced each other and resisted innovations which they regarded as a threat to basic values. In fact, anthropologist Charles Fairbanks speculated that the "impact of acculturation was weakened by the presence of older women." In a study of cultural change among the Lower Creeks anthropolgist Carol Mason concluded that "women and particularly the matrilineage, served as thre thread of cultural continuity from generation to generation." Once commercial deer hunting began, the lengthy absence of men from the villages tended only to reinforce the pattern of matrilineal descent and control over property.[4]

Although contact with Europeans had produced some changes in Creek culture by the late eighteenth century, the role of women in the society had remained relatively stable. The calicos,

woolen blankets, hoes, and knives merely substituted for deerskin shirts and cloaks, digging sticks and flint knives. Even those Creek women who assumed the European surnames of their trader husbands apparently experienced few substantial changes in their roles or status. Because marriage to a trader assured a woman's clan access to the prized European manufactured goods, Creek families, especially elites, such as the Wind Clan, eagerly arranged marriages between their daughters and the traders. Letters and reports usually more concerned with business and war make little mention of how these culturally mixed families lived and worked, but the few accounts we do have show that the traders, more often adopted Indian life styles and maintained few if any contacts with their white relatives. Their fellow Europeans often sneered and called them "Indian countrymen" or even worse, "squaw men." The "whites who had Indian families, according to Benjamin Hawkins, "took no care of them, either to educate them or to teach them anything useful. They were left with their mothers, who were always the slaves of the house, the fathers making money by every means in their power, however roguish, and using the children and the relations of the family as aids." Thus Hawkins, who knew the Indians and traders more intimately than most other white observers nonetheless echoed the stereotypes popular since the early days of European contact. =

The era from 1790 to 1820 was a turbulent period for the Creeks. As southern frontiersmen moved unrelentingly westward, the Creeks were forced to cede one piece of land after another

and were finally convulsed by the disastrous Creek War of 1813-14. At the same time, the deerskin trade which had supplied them with European manufactured goods for almost a hundred years was disintegrating. Abandoned by their feckless Spanish and British allies, they could no longer resist the efforts of the United States government to "civilize" them and confiscate their land. A new generation of leaders, mostly mixed bloods who often lived up to the stereotype of the opportunistic mestizo, took control of Creek political institutions and manipulated the councils to serve their own ends. But that story has already been written. On the other hand, the role of women and their response to the government's "civilization" program is only faintly perceived. The Indian agent and Jeffersonian reformer, Benjamin Hawkins, considered that women played a crucial role in the society and thus had to be targeted as instruments for bringing about change, Thus by analyzing the experiences of Creek women historians should be better able to explain both continuity and change in Creek culture during this era.

From 1796 until his death in 1816, Benjamin Hawkins lived among the Creeks and with missionary zeal promoted the "civilization program" devised by federal officials to transform the Indians into yeoman farmers and confiscate their hunting grounds to provide land for white settlers. For this policy to succeed the system of matrilineal kinship and communal property must give way to the European pattern of inheritance and private ownership of property. Although Hawkins favored the concept of individual

ownership of property, he advocated that each individual property owner should hold "exclusive property in his own farm only" while the Indian nation as a whole held the entire territory in common. That individual property within the communal context was essential, he believed in order to protect the Indians from rapacious white land speculators. Women played an important part in his scheme but not as the owners of real property. Once women understood their proper role in society, Hawkins believed they would be "capable of and willing to become instrumental in civilizing the men."[6] As historian Mary Young explained in her article on Cherokee women and the civilization program, women were to confine themselves to the private sphere and transmit civilization to the next generation while "property-owning males dominated production and politics."[7]

To accomplish these goals Hawkins decided to teach by example. He established a "model farm" at the Flint River agency where he and his assistants raised cotton, peaches, wheat, and vegetables. At the nearby "model factory" he installed saw and grist mills, and a cotton gin and employed weavers to make cloth and teach the Creek women how to use the looms. When the Creeks traveled to visit the agency, they observed the benefits of taking up the new ways, and there they could also learn how to utilize new crops and new technology. During the nineteenth century government officials often used religious groups as agents of the civilization program. Benjamin Hawkins, a thorough-going secularist with little regard for formal religion, accepted two

Moravian missionaries at the Creek agency but confined their activities to their work as skilled craftsmen making spinning wheels, looms and other implements. Hawkins himself was to be the principal teacher and model of enlightened civilization.[8]

With no small measure of pride and arrogance, Benjamin Hawkins saw himself as a benefactor of "these tawney and oppressed daughters of the woods." Believing them to be susceptible to reform because they were so downtrodden as he explained to his friend Thomas Jefferson, he had first decided to set an example of proper family life by forming "amorous connexions with the women" himself and encouraging his assistants to follow suit. Thus far the whites who married Indian women had not set good examples, for the Indian countrymen were rogues in his opinion. The "women have invariably the habit of governing absolutely in all cases when connected with a white man explained Hawkins. "Men of spirit fly from this, tame and base ones submit," he stated emphatically. Small wonder then that the Creeks only laughed at a white man whose Indian wife committed adultery, "whereas if her husband was red she would forfeit her ears." [9]

But Hawkins' first efforts to establish " model families" met with failure. A longtime bachelor, Hawkins had contemplated marriage with a Creek woman prior to his appointment as agent. He had even gone so far as to write Alexander McGillivray, requesting him to "choose for me a young damsel, out of one of your most reputable families...skilled in the customs of her own

Country, and of a mind that will feel the station I shall support her in." Although that matrimonial project came to naught, soon after Hawkins arrived in Creek country, in 1797, the Uchee wife of the prosperous trader, Timothy Barnard, attempted to arrange a marriage between the agent and her daughter, a young widow with three children. He first proceeded to lecture Mrs. Barnard on the deficiencies of Creek marriages, asserting that Indians made slaves of their wives while white men treated theirs as companions. "White men govern their families and provide clothing and food for them. The red men take little care of theirs," he asserted,"and the mothers have the sole direction of the children." If he took an Indian wife, he told Mrs. Barnard, he would take charge of rearing the children and expect them to be obedient to him. Moreover, "the red women should always be proud of their white husbands, should always take part with them and obey them.." The negotiations ended abruptly, for "she would not consent," he wrote in his journal, "that the women and children should be under the direction of the father."[10] Mrs. Barnard though her family was highly acculturated was obviously unwilling to yield her rights as a Creek woman or those of her daughter. The blacksmiths at the Creek agency did take Indian wives, but to Hawkins' dismay the women and their families took control of the "provisions, then the house and pay and finally the absolute government of everything at the agency." At that point, Hawkins intervened, ran off the women, and "prohibited all amorous intercourse between red and white people at the agency."

Still, he had not abandoned his plans to set an example of proper family life for the Creeks. He took in "some young girls of good families" whom he planned to marry off to his assistants and "settle out on farms at such places as I direct" as soon as they were properly trained in the ways of civilization. [11]

Hawkins had the zeal of a missionary among the Indians, but during the early years, at least, he did not try to reform their sexual mores. Instead, like the traders and other Indian countrymen of his day, he thought Indian women were sexually promiscuous, but nevertheless he took advantage of their liberal practices. A bachelor from North Carolina when he arrived in Creek country, he described in some detail his sexual encounters with Creek women, much as a southern male of the time might have related his liasons in the slave quarters. They had "the temper of the mule," he wrote to a friend, "except when they are amorous and then will exhibit all the lovely and amiable qualities of the cat."[12] What Hawkins viewed as a casual relationship for pleasurable purposes, however, the Indians perceived as establishing a social and economic bond. Sexual and marital relationships with white men of rank or property in their view gave the woman's family enhanced social prestige and more importantly, access to her husband's property.[13] Eventually Hawkins came to see this perception of marriage as a barrier to his efforts to establish private ownership of property among the Creeks.[14] Thus his personal rejection of marriage to a Creek woman and his prohibition of such arrangements with his

assistants is understandable as essential in his mind to the success of the "civilizing" program.

Although Hawkins could not hope to effect rapid reform of Creek family institutions, he could put a stop to certain objectionable practices. Endowed with a good measure of the Puritan work ethic, he considered the Indian custom of gift-giving as begging because he failed to understand the practice from the Indian viewpoint. The Creeks like other native Americans had long expected economic and diplomatic transactions to be sealed by an exchange of presents. Since Hawkins was seeking their cooperation in his "civilization" program, they naturally assumed that he would bestow gifts upon them. Thus Creek women frequently sent the agent gifts of food, bean bread, dumplings, hickory oil. But instead of the calico and jewelry they desired, "their great beloved friend and father the agent of the four nations" offered them cotton seed, spinning wheels, cards and looms. In time he suspended the practice of gift-giving altogether and made the Creeks purchase whatever they needed. The Moravian missionaries told of a Creek woman who was very sullen when her husband offered them food. When they offered to pay her for the meal, she fed them generously, explaining that the reason for her negative attitude was her inability to get a spinning wheel without paying for it. At least some of the Creeks evidently resented the agent's failure to understand and respect the "ways of the red people."[15]

To instill the work ethic as well as the attachment to

individual property Hawkins was to implant habits of thrift and industry. Although the ultimate goal was to alter the economic roles of the sexes with the men becoming the principal agriculturalists and the women the producers of clothing, Hawkins began by engaging the women in agricultural commerce. He planned to "give a spur to their industry" by encouraging them to produce and sell surpluses of corn, meat, poultry, and hickory nut oil By increasing their work load they were able to produce additional food products even marketing their hickory nut oil in Mobile and New Orleans. The sale of all these items, however, did not bring in sufficient income to replace the declining revenues of the deerskin trade nor did the profits entice Creek men into becoming yeowman farmers. [14]

Change was slow, but Hawkins saw reason to hope as he observed that some mixed blood and trader families were living more and more like the whites. As early as the 1780s some of them had acquired slaves and livestock and moved out from the Creek towns, settling along the river banks, and fencing their fields. Occasionally a trader or enterprising mixed blood would even relocate his family in one of the new settlements that developed in southern Alabama or along the Georgia frontier. Trader Richard Bailey, for example, had moved his family to the Tensaw settlement when the Creeks of his town kept destroying his cattle which strayed onto their cornfields. Left without a trader, the Indians had begged the Baileys to return and promised to leave their livestock alone. The family did move back; but in the

meantime, the two Bailey daughters had learned to spin among the white women and married white men. The younger girl had even learned to read and write. Hawkins had no difficulty persuading Mrs. Bailey to send her two sons to Philadelphia to be educated by the Quakers. This Wind Clan woman became the agent's role model for Creek women. Her example, he hoped, would be an inspiration for others, but he lamented a few years later that her influence had not spread beyond the members of their own family. He was learning the truth of his own statement that the Creeks adhered "rigidly to their antient customs."[17]

Even for such highly acculturated families as the Baileys the transition between the traditional system of female ownership of property to male possession was gradual. Richard Bailey explained to Hawkins that his cattle were safe from the Creeks only if they were considered the property of his wife and children. Likewise, Sophia Durant and Sehoy Weatherford in seizing their brother's slaves and cattle were claiming their rightful property. The Scotsman, William Panton had disagreed, but he was unable to persuade or cajole them to return the property. In 1800 he had another encounter with Creek women claiming their property; this time, he received a letter from one of the traders complaining that the Wind family women had taken all the cattle from Ecunhutke (White Ground Town) and were trying to get the slaves as well. According to the letter, Sophia Durant was also behind that calumny. As late as 1816 litigants were trying to sort out the inheritance of McGillivray's

property. Had the property been transfered by McGillivray's daughters, Lizzy and Margaret alone inquired a litigant, or "did their uncles & mothers relations join in it according to Creek customs?" Such examples of matrilineal ownership scattered through the documents underline the conservatism of Creek culture in the midst of changing circumstances.[16]

Not only were the Creek mixed bloods slow to incorporate the patriarchal family system, but some were unable or unwilling to change old labor patterns or order their life styles to conform to the ideals of white American society. Sophia Durant, for example, owned a number of slaves; but she either would not or could not manage them. According to Benjamin Hawkins, who found her the antithesis of ideal womanhood, she lived in a small, dirty hut--the worst he had seen among the Indians. She and her sister, Sehoy Weatherford, whom Hawkins denounced as extravagant, compared poorly in his eyes with Mrs. Bailey who was industrious, neat, and clean. Two years later he grudgingly admitted that Sophia Durant could spin and weave and was "making some feeble efforts to obtain clothing for her family," but she was too assertive and too prone to assume what patriarchal societies considered male jobs to be considered a proper feminine role model for Hawkins. The ideal family held up to the Creeks was clearly one where the wife performed household duties and reared the children while her husband worked in the fields or supervised slaves.[17]

Traditional Creeks resisted the new ways. When Benjamin

Hawkins presented his civilization program to Creek councils early in his travels among them, some men responded with hostility while others laughed at the idea that they should take up the plow and their wives should spin and weave. The women, they objected, would be "proud and not obedient to their husbands" if they could clothe themselves. Chiefs of some Upper Towns even threatened to kill any Creek using a plow, undoubtedly seeing it as a symbol of all that threatened their way of life, the tool used by white farmers to destroy Indian hunting grounds. Those who laughed may very well have considered the idea of men plowing effeminate as did other Indians who regarded agricultural labor as women's work. Providing clothing for the family, through hunting and trading was considered a man's responsibility. But Hawkins persisted because he understood the measure of Creek progress to be their adoption of individual ownership of land. If the men worked the land intensively then they would regard it as their own, and women could assume their proper place in the home, preparing food, making clothing, and teaching their children the correct values.[20]

Gradually, some Creeks began to ask for plows and spinning wheels. Once their hunting grounds were gone, they could no longer clothe their families and were thus more receptive to change. A dozen years after initiating the new program Hawkins enthusiastically reported that ninety percent of the Lower Creeks had moved out on farms away from the villages and had begun to raise small quantites of cotton, some wheat, and even flax. He

noted that some men were even aiding the women in the fields and using the plow for corn as well as wheat which meant that they were cultivating the crop which had traditionally been the women's responsibility. The model factory to produce cotton was also proving successful, according to Hawkins. In 1810 the agent proudly announced that the weavers were averaging twenty yards a day, and the Indians were appearing in increasing numbers with thread that was "even, well spun, and the dies good." He had sent 300 spinning wheels the previous year to the Creeks and was requested 500 more in the coming year. Though not as advanced as the Cherokees, the Lower Creeks were making progress. In his mind, their willingness to take up the plow and spinning wheel confirmed the wisdom of the government's policy of forcing land cessions from the Indians. Once they could no longer roam the forests hunting deer, they had no choice but to settle down on individual farms and live a civilized life.[21]

The picture of progress in the Upper Towns which still practiced some commercial hunting and were farther from white settlements was not so bright. For the most part, they depended on raising cattle and hogs to feed themselves and trade for clothing and other manufactured goods. Notorious for their thievery of horses and slaves, they undoubtedly derived part of their income from the sale of both. A few prosperous traders had acquired slaves and planted cotton, but their example evidently failed to inspire the Indians. Most notable among them was the Grierson or Grayson family of Hillibee. Robert Grierson a

prosperous trader had decided to diversify his business by planting cotton and setting up a small cotton factory. He reportedly was marketing 2,000 pounds of cotton annually and had his wife, daughter, and several slaves spinning and weaving. Hawkins repeatedly cited him as an example of the progress made among the Creeks, but Grierson had few imitators. By 1811 Hawkins admitted that there were only nine looms among the Upper Creeks, compared to more than thirty in the Lower Towns. Only a few months before the outbreak of the Creek War, several chiefs from Upper Towns asked Hawkins for more spinning wheels and looms and informed him that their people were more occupied than ever in "domestic concerns, spining, weaving and farming." They assured him that "our people who use these things think not of war."[22]

But not enough Creeks agreed with their chiefs. Instead of following the white man's path to civilization, they went to war to destroy the leaders and instruments of progress. The nativist prophets and their followers unleashed their fury against those mixed bloods and Indians who had adopted the white life style, destroying lifestock and crops, fences and plows, spinning wheels and looms. They directed their wrath at the women who represented the hated ways, mutilating pregnant women and ripping open their wombs. They stripped Mrs. Grierson of her clothing, destroyed her loom and the cloth she had woven. Stories of such barbarism terrified those along the southern frontier and at the same time convinced the "civilizers" that the Indian way of life

must be wiped out and the native people removed from the lands east of the Mississippi. But before those objectives could be accomplished the Creeks must pay for their folly. [23]

At the treaty signing which concluded the Creek War in 1814 Benjamin Hawkins stood powerless to defend those who had accepted his advice and taken on the white man's version of civilization. He watched while General Andrew Jackson confiscated almost half the former Creek Confederacy, not only stripping land away from those who had perpetrated the war, but also nearly half the homeland of his allies, the friendly Creeks. During the two remaining years of his life Benjamin Hawkins attempted to ameliorate the condition of the Creeks, relying, of course, on his own assessment of their needs. In a letter to the Secretary of War dated only months before his death, he presented the case of the survivors of the Fort Mims massacre. "These people will never be suffered by their Chiefs to return again into the nation," he proclaimed, "unless they will in all things conform to the Indian habits, which from their practical knowledge of the plan of civilization is impossible."[24] He was wrong. The acculturated Creeks and mixed bloods were not the downtrodden, the oppressed people cast out from their own country. Instead, it was ultimately the "civilized" Indians and opportunistic mestizos who had the upper hand, and they were apostles of capitalism, enthusiastic proponents of individual ownership of property and patriarchal social institutions.[25]

In 1818 these new "prophets of progress" adopted a code of laws

institutionalizing the concepts of private property and patrimonialism. "It is agreed," they wrote, that when a man dies, and has children living, his children shall have his property. His other relations shall not take the property to the injury of the children." This law made it possible for men such as the Lower Creek headman, William McIntosh, to take advantage of opportunities. It produced political, even economic changes, but it was not a harbinger of rapid social and cultural change. In 1904 and 1905 anthropologist Frank G. Speck collected data from the people of Taskigi Town in Oklahoma and observed that the social unit "was, and is" the clan and that "descent is reckoned through the mother." He explained that if the man "marries into another town he becomes a member of that town, the children all belonging to it as well." As late as 1937 Morris Opler, also an anthropologist, affirmed that a "child's Town membership follows that of his mother." Thus the fundamental matrilineal, matrilocal social structure survived, at least in part, more than a century after the "acquisitive element" (as Michael Green labels them) decreed the legal demise of matrilineal property ownership. Neither Speck nor Opler addresses the issue of property, but the laws of the Creek nation contained vestiges of matrilineal property rights until late in the nineteenth century.[24] Further exploration of archival materials is necessary to reveal the differences between law and custom, to discover the continuity in Creek history as well as the changes. But at the present, we may with some confidence affirm that Sophia Durant and Sehoy

Weatherford not only acted in consort with tradition, they also helped to maintain the rights and values of Creek women in the future.

ENDNOTES

1.William Panton to Lachlan McGillivray, April 10, 1794, JIG Case #6701in Panton, Leslie Papers, John C. Pace Library, University of West Florida, hereinafter cited as PLP; Thomas S. Woodward, Reminiscences of the Creek or Muskogee Indians (Montgomery, Ala.: Barrett and Wimbish, 1859; reprint, Mobile, Ala.: Southern University Press, 1965), 78, 98 and Albert J. Pickett, History of Alabama, and Incidentally of Georgia and Mississippi, from the Earliest Period (1851; 1900; reprint of 1900 edition, Spartanburg, S.C.: The Reprint Company, Publishers, 1975) 345, 392, 418-410, 425. Both Woodward and Pickett discuss the McGillivray sisters though they disagree in particulars. Additiona information is scattered through correspondence and records of the Panton, Leslie Company.

2.Charles Hudson, The Southeastern Indians (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1976), 187, 189, 196-201; John R. Swanton, "Social Organization and Social Usages of the Indians of the Creek Confederacy," Bureau of American Ethnology Annual Report 42 (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1928, 368-388; William S. Willis, "Patrilineal Institutions in Southeastern North America," Ethnohistory 10 (Summer 1963); 250-69. Swanton details Creek social organization. Hudson is a recent anthropological study. Willis points out that there were exceptions to the matrilineal pattern of relationships and inheritance.

3.For examples of trade transactions of Sophia Durant and Sehoy Weatherford see Account, JI Case #1156, JIG Case 6701, August 17 1791, PLP; Correspondence in the Panton, Leslie Papers also refers to trading activities of the McGillivray sisters. See for example McGillivray to Miro, August 12, 1789, AGI PC 202, Unfortunately the records are not sufficiently complete to justify conclusions re the extent of their business operations. Hawkins, Journal, December 20, 1796, Letters, Journals and Writings of Benjamin Hawkins, ed. C.L. Grant (Savannah: Beehive Press, 1980), 1: 24. Pickett, History of Alabama, 419.

4.John Pope, A Tour Through the Southern and Western Territories of the United States of North America (Richmond: John Dixon, 1792; reprint, Arno Press, 1971), 62. Charles H. Fairbanks, "Excavations at Horseshoe Bend, Alabama," Florida Anthropologist 15(June 1962): 41-56; Carol I. Mason "Eighteenth Century Culture Change among the Lower Creeks," Florida Anthropologist 16 (September 1963): 65-80.

5.Numerous sources contain scattered references to marriages and hints of the way these traders and their Indian wives lived. Although both of the following sources contain inaccuracies especially regarding geneaology, they also discuss family relationships and clan affiliations extensively. Woodward, Reminiscences, 52-8, 77-79, passim and George Stiggins, "A Historical Narration of the Geneaology, Traditions and Downfall of the Ispocaga or Creek Tribe of Indians," edited by Theron A. Nunez, Jr. "Creek Nativism and the Creek War of 1813-1814, Ethnohistory 5(1958), (1);\1-47, (2): 131-175, (3): 292-301. Hawkins, Journal, December 14, 1796,1: 18. An excellent discussion of sexual stereotypes is found in David D. Smits,"The 'Squaw Drudge': A Prime Index of Savagism," Ethnohistory 29(1982): 281-306.

6.For Hawkins's ideas of Indian property ownership within the communal context see Hawkins to Dearborn, June 1, 1801, and Hawkins to Dearborn, September 6, 1801, Hawkins, Letters, 1:359, 379. Bernard Sheehan in Seeds of Extinction: Jeffersonian Philanthropy and the American Indian (Chapel Hill: Institute of Early American History and Culture, University of North Carolina Press, 1973), 151, mistakenly asserts that Hawkins was opposed to individual land ownership by the Indians. Hawkins, Journal in Letters, 1: 22.

7.Mary Young, "Women, Civilization, and the Indian Question," in Clio Was a Woman: Studies in the History of American Women, eds.Mabel e. Deutrich and Virginia C. Purdy (Washington,D.C.: Howard University Press, 1980), 98.

8.Hawkins to William Eustis, Sketch of the Affairs of the Creek Agency...in Letters, ed Grant, 2: 552-554. Carl Mauelshagen and Gerald H. Davis, ed. and trans. Partners in the Lord's Work: The Diary of Two Moravian Missionaries in the Creek Country, 1807-1813, (Atlanta: Georgia State College, School of Arts and Sciences Research Paper Number 21, 1969). The missionaries, Burckhard and Petersen were exceedingly frustrated by Hawkins' refusal to help them set up a Christian ministry and preach to the Indians. He was kind to them, but he had little respect for the value of Christian teaching in his "civilization program." For a discussion of the government's use of missionaries to further the "civiling" policy see Bernard Sheehan, Seeds of Extinction: Jeffersonian Philanthropy and the American Indian, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, published for the Institute ofEarly American History and Culture at Williamsburg, Virginia, 1973), especially 119-147.

9.Hawkins to Thomas Jefferson, July 11 1803, in Letters, ed. Grant, 2:455.

10.Hawkins to McGillivray, January 8, 1786, in John W. Caughey, McGillivray of the Creeks (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press,1938), 102. Hawkins, Journal, February 16, 1797, in Letters, ed. Grant, 1: 47-48.

11.Hawkins to Thomas Jefferson, July 11, 1803, in Grant, Letters, 2: 454.

12.Hawkins was quite frank about sexual matters. See for example his letter to William Faulkener, March 4, 1797 in which he offers to provide a "queen", or if he prefers the "custom of the Oriental country" he will give him a half dozen and gives graphic descriptions of fondling their breasts etc. in Letters, ed. Grant, 1: 162. For an account of his own liasons see especially Hawkins to Elizabeth House Trist, November 25, 1797, ibid., 1:162-63.

13.Hudson, Southeastern Indians, 196-202, is an excellent recent analysis of Creek sexual mores by an anthropologist. There are several studies which interpret "elite" sexual arrangements with white men. Although Sylvia Van Kirk studied native Americans in the Great Lakes region, her generalizations about Indian-white relationships seem also applicable to southeastern Indians. See especially Syklvia Van Kir, Many Tender Ties: Women in Fur-Trade Soceity, 1670-1870, (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1980), 28-52, and Jennifer S. H. Brown, Strangers in Blood, Fur Trade Company Families in Indian Country (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1980), 60-64. Regarding the Creeks specifically, a number of observers note that one wife or another was a member of the "Wind Clan," the kinship group which carried more status and prestige than any other among the Creeks. See, for example, Stiggins, "Creek Nativism," 133 and Woodward, Reminiscences, 31. 53.

14.Hawkins to Thomas jefferson, July 11, 1803 in Letters, ed. Grant, 2: 454 and Hawkins to unknown addressee and date unknown, ibid., 2: 457.

15.In Hawkins' correspondence and journal are numerous notations of gifts of food. See, for example, Journal, December 7, 1796, December 8, 1796, December 15, 1796.Mauelshagen & Davis, eds. Partners,49.

16.Hawkins to James McHenry, November 19,m 1797, Letters, ed. Grant 158.

17.Pickett, Alabama, 416. Pickett devotes a chapter to discussing the settlements in south Alabama where many of the residents were Tories and mixed bloods. Hawkins, Journal, December 18, 21, 1796, 21-22, 28; Sketch of the Creek Country in the years 1798 and 1799, 292; Hawkins to Thomas Jefferson, July 11, 1803, 455.

18.Panton to McGillivray, April 10, 1794, PLP; Daniel McGillivray to William Panton, October 13, 1800, Greenslade Papers, in Greenslade Papers, Florida Historical Society Library, University of South Florida, Tampa; John Forbes and Co. to David Tate, November 21, 1816, Cruzat Papers, Box 3, Florida Historical Society Libary, University of South Florida, Tampa.

19.Hawkins, Journal, December 20, 1796, 24; Hawkins, Sketch, 1798 and 1799, 298.

20.Hawkins, Journal, January 5, 1797, 35

21.Hawkins, A Sketch of the Affairs of theCreek Agency..up to the end of May, 1809, in Letters, ed. Grant, 2:551-555; Hawkins to William Eustis, April 8, 1810, ibid. 2:562.

22.See Hawkins' excellent description of Upper Creek towns during his first journey in 1796-1797 in Journal, December 5, 1796-January 3, 1797 in Letters, ed. Grant, 1: 10-33 and later descriptions in Sketch, 1798 and 1799, ibid., 289-307; Hawkins to Silas Dinsmoor, January 6, 1799, 235; Hawkins to William Eustis, Jnuary 6, 1811, 580-581; Hawkins to Eustis, February 24, 1811, 583-584.

23.For the best recent account of the Creek War see Frank Lawrence Owsley, Jr., Struggle for the Gulf Borderlands: The Creek War and the Battle of New Orleans, 1813-1815 (Gainesville, Fl.: University Presses of Florida, 1981), 30-94. The most reliable older narrative is H.S. Halbert and T. H. Ball, The Creek War of 1813 and 1814 (Chicago: Donohue and Henneberry, 1895). Albert Pickett used eyewitness accounts to describe the horrors of the Fort Mims catastrophe, 275. Hawkins reported in detail the Fort Mims story and the Grierson episode in his letter to John Armstrong, September 21, 1813, in Letters, ed. Grant, 2:665-666.

24.See Owsley, Struggle, 86-94, for discussion of the Treaty of Fort Jackson. Hawkins to William H. Crawford, January 19, 1816, 2: 768-769.

25.Michael Green is the best recent analyst of Creek politics, especially his discussion of William McIntosh's rise to power. Politics 54-63, 69-73.

26."Laws of the Creek Nation prclaimed at Broken Arrow, " June 12, 1818, in Secretary of War, Letters Received, Indian Affairs, RG 75, 2-774. For discussion of the impact of these laws on Creek politics, society and economics see Michael Green, Politics, 70-72. Frank G. Speck, "The Creek Indians of Taskigi Town," Memoirs of the American Anthropological Association 2(1907), 114, 117, in A Creek Source Book, ed. William C. Sturtevant (New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1987). Morris

E. Opler, "Report on the History and Contemporary State of Aspects of Creek Social Organization and Government," Papers in Anthropology (Department of Anthropology, University of Oklahoma), 13: 64. Green, Politics, 71.